

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 15-19 and 23-26 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome 112, paragraph 2, rejections. Applicant has canceled Claim 15, and has amended Claims 1 and 21, leaving Claims 1-14 and 16-26 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and (b), and 35 U.S.C. §103(a), have been traversed, that no new matter has been entered, and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Objections to the Drawings

The drawings are objected to for showing in Figure 1 modified forms of construction in the same view, with the alternative embodiment not being shown in phantom.

Applicant has amended Figure 1 to show the alternative embodiment in phantom, which is consistent with the description in paragraph [0023].

As such, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection, which Applicant considers to be overcome.

Objections to the Specification

The specification is objected to for reasons relating to informalities.

Applicant has amended the specification as set forth above, and in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion, to correct for these informalities.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection, which Applicant considers to be overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

The Examiner comments that the term “underlapping” in the claims is used to mean “spaced from”, which Applicant agrees with, and therefore questions why such a term is being considered indefinite, but the Examiner answers this question by stating “the accepted meaning [for the term underlapping] is ‘to extend partly under’.” However, the Examiner does not state from which authority this “accepted meaning” is found. To quite the contrary, Applicant submits that the accepted meaning of the term “underlap” is to mean that there is a gap between two areas or features. For example, when hanging wallpaper, the sheets should be arranged so that they neither **overlap** (one on top of the other) nor **underlap** (spaced apart with a gap between). See for example, <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=underlap>. As such, Applicant’s use of the term “underlap” is used in an accepted manner to mean (opposite to overlap) spaced apart with a gap between, which is clearly consistent with the description in the specification by repeated reference to the underlap dimensions (gaps between) 234, 236, 248, 250.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed subject matter is described in such a manner that reasonably conveys to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention, and consistently described the invention with more than sufficient clarity recognizable by one skilled in the art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection, which Applicant considers to be traversed.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-6, 13 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Lampman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,889,073, hereinafter Lampman).

Claims 1-6 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lian et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,804,969, hereinafter Lian).

Claims 1-4, 6, 12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Su (U.S. Patent No. 6,163,717, hereinafter Su).

Applicant overcomes these rejections for the following reasons.

The Examiner states that Claims 15-19 and 23-25 would be allowable if rewritten to include limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim, and to overcome the 112, paragraph 2, rejections.

Applicant has canceled Claim 15 and has amended Claim 1 to include all limitations of Claim 15.

Applicant has also amended Claim 21 to include all limitations of Claim 15.

Applicant has further provided comments set forth above to overcome the 112, paragraph 2, rejections.

Accordingly, and in view of Claim 15 being considered allowable, Applicant submits that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are now rendered moot, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw of these rejections.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampman or Su or Lian.

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lampman.

Applicant overcomes these rejections for the following reasons.

In view of the amendments set forth above in connection with the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102, Applicant submits that all rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have also

been rendered moot, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

In light of the forgoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, 35 U.S.C. §102(e), 35 U.S.C. §102(b), and 35 U.S.C. §103(a), have been overcome, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

If a communication with Applicant's Attorneys would assist in advancing this case to allowance, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned so that any such issues may be promptly resolved.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required for this amendment, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 07-0845.

In the event that an extension of time is required, or may be required in addition to that requested in a petition for extension of time, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time that is required to make this response timely and is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the above-identified Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

Applicant's Attorneys

By: 

David Arnold
Registration No: 48,894
Customer No. 23413

Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, Connecticut 06002
Telephone: (860) 286-2929
Fax: (860) 286-0115